

ATTACHMENT 10: EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SELECTION PROCESS

1. The Quad Chart/White Paper (Phase I) and invited full proposal (Phase II) selection process will be conducted based upon a technical subject matter expert review as described in Federal Acquisition Regulation Subparts 6.102(d)(2) and 35.016. Each proposal will be evaluated based on the merit and relevance of the specific proposal as it relates to the DTRA program rather than against other proposals for research in the same general area. All documents necessary for the review and evaluation of the Phase I and Phase II submissions must be provided as described in Section 6 of this BAA.

1.1. Phase I - Quad Chart/White Paper Evaluation.

1.1.1 The evaluation will be based on the three criteria listed below. The first two criteria will be scored as Outstanding (O), Good (G), Acceptable (A), Marginal (M) or Unacceptable (U). The third criterion (Safety and Security of Personnel/Facilities to Perform the Proposed Effort) will be scored as either Acceptable (A) or Unacceptable (U). Any criterion scored as "Unacceptable (U)" will render the offeror's proposal "Not Selectable," and the proposal will not be considered further.

1.1.2. Phase I evaluation criteria to be used to evaluate and select Quad Charts/White Papers are listed below in order of decreasing importance.

1.1.2.1. Scientific and Technical Merit. The objective of this criterion is to assess the extent to which the Offeror has an innovative, unique, high payoff, and comprehensive technical approach based on sound scientific principles. Offerors must demonstrate that their approach is innovative, unique, and responsive to the topic as presented in this solicitation; that the technical approach is sound; that they have an understanding of critical technical issues and risk and that they have a plan to reasonably mitigate those risks where possible. Significant improvements in chemical and biological technology capability above the 'state-of-the-art' are sought.

1.1.2.2. Value to Mission Goals. The objective of this criterion is to assess the extent to which the Offeror has a credible and feasible scientific solution that meets or exceeds the topic requirements and provides a rapid path of application of the technology to the Department of Defense. Offerors must demonstrate a clear knowledge of desired military capabilities and indicate the manner in which the technology will transition. Proposals must demonstrate how the proposed research supports the program goals and responds to the specific topic areas. Offerors must demonstrate that the new technology can be implemented or utilized by end-users as a means to improve their operational capabilities.

1.1.2.3 Safety and Security of Personnel/Facilities to Perform the Proposed Effort. The objective of this criterion is to determine if the offeror's team has the requisite expertise, skills and resources necessary to provide the appropriate levels of safety and security for the proposed program. This includes cleared personnel, secure facilities, and laboratories certified by government authorities for hazardous work. Work performed and data created

under potential efforts will, in many cases, be subject to government issued security classification guides and will have to be conducted and prepared in accordance with established guidelines for laboratory safety and information security. In addition, if the hazardous materials to be investigated meet certain criteria, compliance with surety agent handling and accountability rules is required. These requirements may include: laboratories, animal facilities and glove boxes with appropriate engineering controls, current inspection/calibration standards, alarm systems, contamination controls; hazard assessment and analysis plans; defined standard operating procedures; appropriate training programs; personal protective equipment (PPE); the ability to meet or exceed established occupational health guidelines; provision of onsite medical treatment; validated decontamination plans; robust detection and monitoring systems; appropriate emergency response plans; physical security; accountability; onsite transportation plans; and an established personnel reliability program (PRP) or its equivalent

1.2 Phase II - Full Proposal Evaluation.

1.2.1 The evaluation will be based on the four criteria listed below. The first two criteria will be scored Outstanding (O), Good (G), Acceptable (A), Marginal (M) or Unacceptable (U). The third criterion (Safety and Security of Personnel/Facilities to Perform the Proposed Effort) will be scored as either Acceptable (A) or Unacceptable (U). The fourth criterion (Cost Realism) will be evaluated for reasonableness and the offeror's understanding of the project, perception of risks, and ability to organize and perform the work. Any criterion scored as "Unacceptable (U)" will render the offeror's proposal "Not Selectable," and the proposal will not be considered further.

1.2.2. Phase II evaluation criteria to be used to evaluate and select full proposals are listed below in decreasing order of importance.

1.2.2.1. Scientific and Technical Merit: The objective of this criterion is to assess the extent to which the Offeror has an innovative, unique, high payoff, and comprehensive technical approach based on sound scientific principles. Offerors must demonstrate that their approach is innovative, unique and responsive to the topic as presented in this solicitation; that the technical approach is sound; that they have an understanding of critical technical issues and risks and that they have a plan for mitigation of those risks. Significant improvements in chemical and biological technology capability above the 'state-of-the-art' are sought.

1.2.2.2. Value to Mission Goals: The objective of this criterion is to assess the extent to which the Offeror has a credible and feasible scientific solution that meets or exceeds the topic requirements and provides a rapid path of application of the technology to the Department of Defense. Offerors must demonstrate a clear knowledge of desired military capabilities and indicate the manner in which the technology will transition. Proposals must demonstrate how the proposed research supports the program goals and responds to the specific topic areas. Offerors must demonstrate that the new technology can be implemented or utilized by end-users as a means to improve their operational capabilities.

1.2.2.3. Capability to Perform the Proposed Effort (including: Personnel, Facilities, Safety and Security). The objective of this criterion is to assess the extent to which the offeror's team has the requisite expertise, skills and resources necessary to perform the proposed program and to assess the offeror's capability to provide the appropriate levels of safety and security for the effort.

For the general category of personnel and facilities, this includes an assessment of the team's management construct, key personnel, facilities and past technical experience in conducting similar efforts of the proposed scope. Offerors must demonstrate that their team has the necessary background and experience to perform this project. Facilities should be detailed with discussion of any unique capabilities pertinent to the research. Subcontractors may include Government facilities or Agencies; however the unique expertise or specialized facilities provided through their inclusion must be clearly presented.

For the category of safety and security, this includes cleared personnel, secure facilities, and laboratories certified by government authorities for hazardous work. Work performed and data created under potential efforts will, in many cases, be subject to government issued security classification guides and will have to be conducted and prepared in accordance with established guidelines for laboratory safety and information security. In addition, if the hazardous materials to be investigated meet certain criteria, compliance with surety agent handling and accountability rules is required. These requirements may include: laboratories, animal facilities and glove boxes with appropriate engineering controls, current inspection/calibration standards, alarm systems, contamination controls; hazard assessment and analysis plans; defined standard operating procedures; appropriate training programs; personal protective equipment (PPE); the ability to meet or exceed established occupational health guidelines; provision of onsite medical treatment; validated decontamination plans; robust detection and monitoring systems; appropriate emergency response plans; physical security; accountability; onsite transportation plans; and an established personnel reliability program (PRP) or its equivalent.

The objective of this criterion is to determine if the offeror's team has the requisite expertise, skills and resources necessary to provide the appropriate levels of safety and security for the proposed program

1.2.2.5. Cost Realism and Reasonableness. This objective of this criterion is to establish that the proposed costs are reasonable and realistic for the technical approach offered and to assess the Offeror's practical understanding of the scope of the proposed effort.

1.3. Other factors that may be considered are duplication with other research, program balance across research topics, past performance and budget limitations. The Government will also evaluate the impact of any proposed limitations to the use of intellectual property (e.g. asserted technical data/computer software restrictions or patents) during the selection and/or negotiation process, and may request additional information from the Offeror, as may be necessary, to evaluate the Offeror's assertions.

1.4. Past Performance. Prior to award, the Government reserves the right to perform a review of past performance. Sources for past performance review may include but are not limited to the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) and the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIS).

1.5. Other Considerations:

- 1.5.1. The government reserves the right to select all, some, or none of the proposals submitted under the BAA.
- 1.5.2 The government also reserves the right to make selections and awards without opening discussions with Offerors.
- 1.5.3 At any time within the acquisition process, the PCO may determine that a portion of the work selected within a represents a substantial change to the original scope of work proposed.
- 1.5.4 The PCO shall make a final determination on selectees' responsibility and responsiveness to BAA terms and conditions.
- 1.5.5 Any of these determinations may render an impending proposal or selectee ineligible for contract award.